REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 3, 16, 17, and 19 have been formally amended to clarify the scope of the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and original claims, specifically on page 3, lines 1-3 and page 10, lines 17-21.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because the Rejection asserts that the claimed "plurality of user interface images" is not shown in the Figures. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, as stated on page 9, line 30 – page 10, line 2 and referring to Figure 1, "[t]he database 138 contains data representing the **multiple user interface images 140** and the multiple executable procedures 142. The multiple user interface images 140 are associated with corresponding multiple organizations". Thus, the claimed element is clearly shown in Figure 1 (and elsewhere) and properly described in accordance with 35 USC 112 such as to enable the claimed arrangement. The claimed "plurality of user interface images" is denoted in Figure 1 by reference numeral "140". Moreover, on page 7 of the present application, it states that Figures 2 – 14 depict the plurality of user interface images (page 7, lines 20-22). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that no modification to either the drawing or the specification is needed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1 – 19 under 35 USC 101

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is not directed towards statutory subject matter. While the Rejection notes claim 1 in the preamble thereof, the discussion of the Rejection appears to reject claims 1 – 19. Therefore, Applicant will treat the Rejection as being intended over claims 1 – 19.

The Rejections states that the components of the system are software per se and therefore are not patentable subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The system claimed throughout claims 1 – 19 may include a database, a command processor and/or an authorization processor. These elements are clearly described in the specification as

being hardware. Specifically, page 10, lines 9 – 11 state "[e]ach of the communication processor 132, the command processor 134, the authorization processor 136 **may be implemented in** software and/or **hardware** and operates responsive to a software program stored in the database 138." Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed system fully complies with 35 USC 101 and contains patentable subject matter. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 – 19 under 35 USC 101 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e)

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Thompson et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0229522).

Amended claim 1 recites a system enabling individual organizations of a plurality of different organizations to manage access of their own respective employees to at least one remotely located application hosted by an application service provider. At an application service provider site, at least one database is included and contains data representing a plurality of user interface images associated with a corresponding plurality of organizations and a plurality of executable procedures associated with the corresponding plurality of user interface images. An executable procedure supports a user of a particular organization of the plurality of organizations in managing access of employees of the particular organization to an application hosted by an application service provider and used by said plurality of organizations. A command processor employs the at least one database for initiating execution of a particular executable procedure in response to a command initiated at a remote location associated with the particular organization using a particular user interface image associated with the particular executable procedure and with the particular organization. The particular executable procedure supports the user in managing and granting access of an employee of the particular organization to an application and associated application data specific to the particular organization and excluding access to the application data specific to the particular organization by employees of organizations other than the particular organization. For the reasons presented below, Applicant respectfully submits that Thompson fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of each feature claimed in amended claim 1 and does not anticipate amended claim 1.

Unlike the present claimed system, Thompson describes a benefit management system that provides a portal-based information management and collaborative business process application. The Thompson system and method is focused at the benefit broker/consultant and is configured to capture employee benefit management data, such as demographic data and plan data. One or more users of the Thompson system are provided with customized user access to the centralized application for use in performing one or more various benefit plan management functions, such as, for example, marketing, plan design; enrollment; administration; and communication between one or more application users (see Abstract). Thus, contrary to the claimed system, the Thompson system merely enables access of data after authorization has been completed and does NOT allow individual customers to manage and control their own access rights as well as exclude access of "application data specific to said particular organization" from other users **without the need to contact the application service provider (ASP).**

Contrary to the claimed system, Thompson, in Figure 8 and the corresponding description, describes an ASP (application service provider) environment wherein data access is controlled **AFTER** user authorization is completed. In the claimed invention in contrast, "the system 100 enables individual organizations 104 of multiple different organizations to manage access of employees to a remotely located application 123 hosted by an application service provider 121" (Application, page 9,lines 27-30). Client management of a particular application hosted by an ASP is NOT equivalent to the environment which is described in Thompson. Thompson, in paragraph [0271] (and Figure 8) which was cited as anticipating the claimed features, explicitly describes a "multi-tiered architecture 900 for an application service provider". Thompson describes the three tiers as the client tier (a user interface), a middle tier (business logic) and a data tier (application data storage accessible by users). However, this is fundamentally different from the present claimed invention because this architecture functions to allow a user to access applications and data AFTER a user is previously authorized to do. The Thompson three tiered architecture described in paragraphs [0271], [0273] and [0275] provides no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling description of use of a "particular **executable procedure**" associated with an organization specific **user interface** image "supporting the user in **managing and granting access** of an employee of the particular organization to an application and associated application data specific to said particular organization and **excluding access** to said application data specific to said particular

organization by employees of organizations other than said particular organization" as recited in the present claimed invention. Unlike Thompson, the claimed system enables individual customer organizations of an ASP to manage their OWN access of their own employees without ASP intervention.

Figure 1 of the present application shows a system for accessing a server via firewall to grant rights using data 123 and application 125. However, data 123 and application 125 are **NOT** an **APPLICATION OR APPLICATION DATA** employed by a user in processing data but are authorization related applications and data e.g. permissions (Application, page 14 lines 10-15 and page 15 lines 8-18 etc) used to grant access to the application and application data. This architecture is neither disclosed nor suggested by Thompson.

Thompson superficially describes Authorization to access and limit rights to access an application and application data in paragraphs [0266], [0267], [0269], [0283] and [0285]. However, these paragraphs fail to disclose or suggest organization specific use and associated organization specific procedures as claimed in the present claimed invention. Thompson merely shows that a user admin functionality provides the application administrator with the ability to create a user and user authorization, (Thompson, [0266]). However, Thompson nowhere suggests "in response to a command initiated at a remote location associated with the particular organization using a particular user interface image associated with the particular executable procedure and with the particular organization, the particular executable procedure supporting the user in managing and granting access of an employee of the particular organization to an application and associated application data specific to said particular organization and excluding access to said application data specific to said particular organization by employees of organizations other than said particular organization" as claimed. Thus, Thompson does not show or suggest a system enabling individual customers of an ASP service to manage their own access rights excluding access by other customers without need to consult the ASP as in the present claimed invention. As each feature claimed in claim 1 is neither shown or suggested by Thompson, Applicant respectfully submits that Thompson does not anticipate the present claimed invention. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Amended claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered patentable because Thompson neither discloses nor suggests "said at least one database, said command processor, said application and associated application data specific to said particular organization are located at said application service provider site behind a firewall and access through said firewall by users of said plurality of organizations". Specifically, Thompson is not concerned with users managing their own client access to data at an ASP. As discussed above, Thompson describes an ASP environment and operation thereof. Thompson neither discloses nor suggest "initiating execution of a particular executable procedure in response to a command initiated at a remote location associated with the particular organization...the particular executable procedure supporting the user in managing and granting access of an employee of the particular organization to an application and associated application data specific to said particular organization and excluding access to said application data specific to said particular organization by employees of organizations other than said particular organization". Contrary to the claimed arrangement, the ASP environment of Thompson, while enabling access to data and applications, does not enable a remote user to **control and manage user access** by granting access and/or excluding access to data and/or applications as in the claimed arrangement. Instead, the user permissions of Thompson are controlled at the ASP site by the ASP. This is NOT equivalent to the present claimed invention. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 2 be withdrawn.

Amended claim 3 is dependent on claims 1 and 2 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 2. Claim 3 is also considered patentable because Thompson neither discloses nor suggests that the "particular executable procedure and said particular user interface image are specifically associated with said particular organization" and that the "authorization processor excludes access of the user and employees of the particular organization to user interface images and executable procedures and data associated with organizations other than the particular organization" as claimed in claim 3. The section of Thompson cited on page 5 of the Rejection ([0284]) makes a cursory statement indicating the Thompson system has access controls. However, this is not 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of the claimed authorization processor which "excludes access" to "executable procedures and data associated with organizations **other than the particular organization**" as in the present claimed invention. There is nothing in Thompson that enables managing user access to

organization specific data and applications as performed in the present claimed invention. The claimed system utilizes a "particular executable procedure" and a "particular user interface image" that is "specifically associated with said particular organization" in "managing and granting access of an employee" AND "excluding access...by employees of organizations **other than the particular organization**". These features are neither disclosed nor suggested by Thompson. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Thompson does not anticipate the present invention claimed in claim 3. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

Claim 4 is dependent on claims 1 – 3 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 – 3. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

Claim 5 is dependent on claims 1 – 4 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 – 4. Claim 5 is also considered patentable because Thompson fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure that "the directory of permissions comprises a Microsoft compatible Active Control List (ACL)" as recited in the present invention. Instead, the cited section merely describes roles being used to give differing levels of access. This is NOT equivalent to the claimed feature and thus does not anticipate the claimed feature. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

Claim 6 is dependent on claims 1 – 4 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 – 4. Claim 6 is also considered to be patentable because Thompson neither discloses nor suggests, "the authorization processor removes the permission of the user and employees of the particular organization in response to addition of the particular organization as a new organization to the plurality of organizations," as recited in the present claimed invention. Thus, when the particular organization is added to the plurality of organizations using the application hosted by the ASP, the "authorization processor removes the permission of the user and employees of the particular organization," so that the particular employees are only able to access the data of their particular organization. Applicant respectfully submits that Thompson is silent with regards to the affirmative act of removing permission. As there is no suggestion or description in Thompson of actively removing permission, there is also no suggestion or description for when that permission is removed, such as "in response to

addition of the particular organization as a new organization to the plurality of organizations," as recited in the present claimed invention. The passages cited in the Office Action ([0284], [0286] and [0023] – [0025]) merely describes limiting access to the Thompson system is provided through a portal. This is not equivalent to the present claimed feature. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 6 be withdrawn.

Claim 7 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Claim 8 is also considered patentable because, contrary to the assertion on page 5 of the Rejection, Thompson neither discloses nor suggests the present claimed feature. The Rejection states that the "edit-control access" stated in paragraph [0286] anticipates the claimed feature of "an executable procedure" that "enables the user to at least one of, (a) add an employee and (b) remove an employee of an organization as a user entitled to **access the application hosted by the application service provider**". However, Thompson merely discloses ASP-based control of ASP access. This is fundamentally different from the present claimed invention which operates "in response to a command initiated **at a remote location associated with the particular organization**". Thus, the claimed system advantageously enables user management to grant and exclude access of employees remotely and without the intervention of the ASP hosting the application being accessed. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

Claim 9 is dependent on claims 1 and 8 and is patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claims 1 and 8. Claim 9 is also considered to be patentable because Thompson neither discloses nor suggests, "the executable procedure changes authorization information associated with the added or removed employee," as recited in the present claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that contrary to the assertion in the Rejection, paragraph [0286] of Thompson merely describes using roles, context and relation when developing different behavior of panels and business objects such that user permissions may change depending on context. However, this is not equivalent changing authorization of an employee when the employee is removed from

the system or added to the system. The present claimed invention, on the other hand, provides for "an executable procedure", and not a developer, to change "authorization information associated" with users and further provides no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of changing authorization information "with the added or removed employee." Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Claim 10 is also considered patentable because Thompson provides no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in paragraph [284] (or elsewhere) of the present claimed feature. Rather, the cited section provides for an authorization service but does so superficially and not in a manner to enable anticipation of the present claimed feature. The claimed arrangement recites "an executable application enables the user to amend information used in authorizing a particular employee of an organization to access the application hosted by the application service provider". Thompson does not disclose or suggest how authentication may occur and certainly does not provide any enabling elements to "amend information used in authorizing" a user. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 12 are dependent on claim 1 and are considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Claims 11 and 12 are also considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 2 and 10 because Thompson, while describing authentication of users, does so in a superficial manner and does not provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of the claimed "authorization processor" that operates in the claimed manner. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 11 and 12 be withdrawn.

Claim 13 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn.

Claim 14 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Claim 14 is also considered patentable because Thompson neither discloses nor suggests that "the particular executable procedure

comprises a template procedure customized by at least one of, (a) the user and (b) a technician" as recited in the present claimed invention. Contrary to the assertion on page 7 of the Rejection, paragraph [0076] of Thompson neither discloses nor suggests the claimed feature. Rather, the cited section of Thompson provides a customizable template for different benefit plans to be utilized by the benefit designer ASP of Thompson. The template of Thompson "ensures [plan] design flexibility **for total plan customization** and captures the information necessary to evolve the application" (Thompson, para. [0076]). This is **fundamentally different** from the claimed "particular executable procedure" which operates "in response to a command initiated at a remote location associated with the particular organization" and "support[s] the user in managing and granting access of an employee of the particular organization to an application and associated application data specific to said particular organization and excluding access to said application data specific to said particular organization by employees of organizations other than said particular organization". Thompson enables customized benefit plan design via a template and has nothing to do with managing user access by granting or excluding users from the system. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claim 15 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 16 is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 17 is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 - 3. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

Claim 18 is dependent on claim 17 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 17. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 19 is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 2. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that Thompson provides no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure that anticipates the features claimed in claims 1, 16, 17 and 19. As claims 2 – 15 are dependent on claim 1 and claim 18 is dependent on claim 17, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 – 15 and 17 are also not anticipated by Thompson. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 19 is respectfully requested.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
Harry Snyder

1 June 2007

By:_____
Alexander J. Burke
Reg. No. 40,425

Alexander J. Burke
Intellectual Property Department
Siemens Corporation,
Customer No.: 28524
Tel. 732 321 3023
Fax 732 321 3030
June 1, 2007